

Procedural Readiness, Substantive Constraints: Implementing P5-PPRA in an Indonesian Madrasah

Yola Mairahman¹, Gusmira Wita^{2*}

¹Ganesha Operation, Indonesia

²Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

*Corresponding author, e-mail: gusmirawita@fis.unp.ac.id

Abstract

This qualitative case study examines teacher readiness and implementation constraints during the early enactment of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project and Rahmatan lil 'Alamin Student Profile (P5-PPRA) at MAN 2 Kota Padang. Fieldwork was conducted in August 2024 through observation, interviews, and document study with 10 purposively selected informants: a vice principal for curriculum, a project coordinator, two facilitators, a sociology teacher, and five students. Source and technique triangulation supported credibility. The findings reveal a clear distinction between procedural readiness and substantive enactment. The madrasah established a facilitation team, themes, schedules, and project structures, but implementation was constrained by modules prepared while activities were already underway, uneven distribution of student responsibilities, limited time, financing pressures, incomplete coordination, and unequal group participation. The study argues that formal completion does not demonstrate mature implementation. P5-PPRA is better understood as an organizational learning process in which leadership, facilitators, teachers, students, resources, assessment, and reflection must become progressively aligned.

Keywords: Merdeka Curriculum; madrasah education; P5-PPRA; teacher readiness; qualitative case study.

How to Cite: Mairahman, Y. & Wita, G. (2024). Procedural Readiness, Substantive Constraints: Implementing P5-PPRA in an Indonesian Madrasah. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(2), 64-72.



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2024 by author.

Introduction

The Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project and the Rahmatan lil Alamin Student Profile (P5-PPRA) place project work, character formation, religious moderation, collaboration, and contextual learning inside the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum in Indonesian madrasahs. Their educational promise is significant because students are expected to encounter values through inquiry and collective action rather than through declarative instruction alone. Yet the existence of a project schedule, coordinator, theme, and assessment form does not necessarily mean that meaningful project learning has been achieved. Implementation quality depends on how institutional structures are translated into time, roles, resources, teacher collaboration, and student participation.

This distinction can be described as the difference between procedural readiness and substantive enactment. Procedural readiness is visible when a school has formally established the organizational architecture of the program: coordinators are appointed, themes are selected, schedules are produced, and responsibilities are allocated. Substantive enactment concerns what happens within those arrangements: whether teachers share an understanding of the project, whether planning precedes implementation by enough time, whether students receive equitable opportunities to contribute, whether budgets and facilities support the chosen activities, and whether reflection connects the project to the intended profile dimensions. Research on the Pancasila Student

Profile has similarly emphasized that project-based character education requires more than administrative compliance (Irawati et al., 2022; Rachmawati et al., 2022; Safitri et al., 2022).

Madrasahs add another layer because P5 is integrated with the Rahmatan lil Alamin profile. The program is expected to connect national civic values with Islamic commitments to moderation, social responsibility, humanity, and peaceful coexistence. This makes coordination especially important. Teachers need a shared interpretation of the profile dimensions and a common understanding of what counts as evidence that students are developing them. Without that shared interpretation, a project can become an event that is administratively complete but pedagogically fragmented.

The case of MAN 2 Kota Padang is analytically valuable because the study captured the institution during its first year of P5-PPRA implementation. First-year implementation exposes organizational assumptions that may become less visible once routines are established. Data from curriculum leadership, project coordination, facilitators, a sociology teacher, and students reveal how formal preparation interacted with compressed planning time, uneven task distribution, financing, and coordination. Rather than asking whether P5-PPRA was simply successful or unsuccessful, the study examines where readiness was strong and where implementation remained fragile.

The article asks: How was procedural readiness established for P5-PPRA at MAN 2 Kota Padang, what substantive constraints emerged during implementation, and what do those constraints reveal about institutional learning in the first year of the program? The contribution is a distinction between administrative preparedness and pedagogical readiness, interpreted through organizational coordination rather than through a binary evaluation of compliance.

Case-study interpretation was also informed by Indonesian methodological discussion of bounded qualitative inquiry (Iswadi et al., 2023).

Method

This study used a qualitative case-study design to examine teacher readiness and implementation constraints during the early implementation of P5-PPRA at MAN 2 Kota Padang. Fieldwork was conducted in August 2024, when the program was being organized and enacted in the madrasah. The case-study design was appropriate because the research question concerned the interaction of curriculum leadership, facilitator work, student participation, scheduling, resources, and project routines within a bounded institutional setting rather than the measurement of a treatment effect.

Ten informants were selected purposively because they occupied different positions in the implementation process: the vice principal for curriculum, one project coordinator, two facilitators, one sociology teacher, and five students. This distribution allowed the study to compare policy and coordination perspectives with the experiences of teachers who facilitated activities and students who participated in them. The purpose was not statistical representation, but access to actors who could describe how project requirements were interpreted and translated into school routines.

Data were collected through observation, semi-structured interviews, and document study. Observation focused on how project activities were organized, how responsibilities were distributed, and how students participated during implementation. Interviews explored readiness, planning, coordination, constraints, and perceptions of the project process. Documents were used to examine schedules, project organization, modules, and other institutional arrangements relevant to the implementation. Source triangulation compared accounts across leadership, facilitators, teachers, and students, while technique triangulation compared interview statements with observations and documents.

Analysis followed the interactive qualitative logic of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Field material was first organized around recurrent implementation issues. These categories were then compared across informants and data sources, with particular attention to discrepancies between formal arrangements and enacted practice. The final interpretation distinguished procedural readiness—having teams, schedules, themes, roles, and formal structures—from substantive enactment—the degree to which planning, participation, resources, facilitation, and reflection became coherent in practice.

The study does not treat P5-PPRA as an intervention whose causal effect can be inferred from the case. It examines implementation quality during an early phase. The central analytic question is therefore not whether the project “worked” in an experimental sense, but how organizational readiness translated into practice and where translation became difficult. This boundary is important because completion of a project schedule can coexist with uneven participation, compressed preparation, resource pressure, or limited pedagogical alignment.

Results and Discussion

Formal structures were established before substantive routines matured

The madrasah had formed a facilitation structure, assigned coordinators and facilitators, selected themes, and arranged a block schedule for implementation. These steps show that the organization had moved beyond policy awareness into procedural preparation. Leadership was able to mobilize personnel and establish a visible project architecture. Yet procedural readiness was not equivalent to substantive readiness. Teachers and facilitators were still interpreting what the project required pedagogically while activities were already being prepared and implemented.

Module development overlapped with implementation

One of the clearest constraints was the compressed relationship between planning and enactment. Project modules were being prepared while activities were already underway. This reduced the time available to align objectives, task sequences, materials, assessment, and student responsibilities before implementation. The consequence was not complete program failure; rather, facilitators had to make decisions while teaching, which increased variability in how activities were understood and carried out.

Student participation was uneven within group work

The project required collaboration, but responsibility was not always distributed evenly. Students reported that assigned roles did not consistently match interests or capacities, and some groups depended heavily on a smaller number of active members. These findings show why the existence of group work should not be treated as evidence of collaboration by itself. Collaboration becomes substantive when roles are understood, contribution is visible, students have a reason to depend on one another, and facilitators monitor participation rather than only the final product.

Time, financing, and coordination constrained depth

The block schedule had to coexist with regular academic demands, while project activities also required financial and material resources. Coordination among teachers, facilitators, and students was not always sufficient to resolve these pressures. These constraints narrowed the amount of time available for preparation and reflection. They also show that curriculum implementation is partly a resource-allocation problem: schools must align instructional time, staff workload, facilities, funding, and communication if project-based character education is to become more than a sequence of scheduled events.

Completion did not automatically indicate mature implementation

The project could be completed procedurally even though participants were still learning how to interpret its aims, organize tasks, and connect activities with the intended dimensions of the Pancasila Student Profile and Rahmatan lil 'Alamin profile. This gap between completion and maturity is the central empirical finding. It suggests that early implementation should be assessed not only through whether activities occurred, but through the coherence of planning, facilitator understanding, student agency, collaboration, reflection, and institutional support.

Related classroom studies in Indonesian secondary education show that active and project-oriented approaches depend on carefully structured tasks, teacher facilitation, collaborative roles, and appropriate learning media (Hadi et al., 2024; Ikrami et al., 2024; Iqbal & Rahmadhani, 2024). Studies of PBL and PjBL likewise indicate that student activity becomes educationally meaningful when problem structure, group participation, and teacher guidance are aligned (Saputra & Putra, 2024; Satria & Yaferson, 2024). These findings reinforce the distinction between having a project structure and achieving substantive project enactment.

Discussion

Procedural readiness and substantive enactment are different capacities

The study's central distinction between procedural readiness and substantive enactment helps explain why schools can appear administratively prepared while still experiencing pedagogical difficulty. Curriculum reforms usually require visible organizational actions: forming teams, setting schedules, selecting themes, preparing documents, assigning responsibilities, and reporting completion. These actions are necessary because they create a structure in which implementation can occur. They are not sufficient because the educational value of a project depends on how teachers and students understand and use that structure. Research on the Pancasila Student Profile has similarly emphasized that project implementation must connect curricular intentions with lived student activity rather than remain a formal requirement (Irawati et al., 2022; Rachmawati et al., 2022; Safitri et al., 2022).

This difference can be framed as a capacity problem. Procedural capacity concerns the ability to organize resources and comply with requirements. Substantive capacity concerns the ability to interpret aims, design

meaningful tasks, facilitate participation, assess development, and learn from implementation. A school may possess the first before the second. In that situation, the appropriate response is not to label implementation unsuccessful, but to recognize that organizational learning is still occurring. Early implementation should therefore include deliberate opportunities for facilitators to compare experiences, revise modules, and develop a shared understanding of what quality looks like.

Project modules should precede, not chase, implementation

The overlap between module development and ongoing activity is more than an administrative inconvenience. A project module can function as a pedagogical coordination device: it links objectives, sequences, roles, resources, assessment, and reflection. When the module is incomplete, facilitators are more likely to improvise these connections independently. Improvisation can be productive when teachers are experienced and the objectives are clear, but under conditions of reform it can also produce uneven expectations. The findings therefore support allocating protected planning time before the project block begins.

Planning does not mean rigidly scripting every classroom event. Project-based learning requires responsiveness to students and context. The important point is that the core design decisions should be explicit: what profile dimensions are being developed, what evidence will indicate those dimensions, what milestones students must complete, how groups will distribute responsibility, and how facilitators will respond when participation or resources become uneven. Studies of P5 implementation have repeatedly identified teacher understanding and planning as conditions for moving beyond ceremonial or product-oriented activity (Ana, 2023; Annisa et al., 2024; Aprila et al., 2024).

Collaboration requires accountable interdependence

Unequal participation within groups is a predictable risk in project learning. Students may divide work efficiently without engaging collaboratively, or a few members may carry the intellectual and practical burden while others remain peripheral. The case indicates that role assignment needs more than distribution; it needs accountability and interdependence. Roles should be meaningful, rotate when appropriate, and connect to a shared product or decision. Facilitators also need intermediate checkpoints where contribution can be observed before the final presentation or product.

This issue is especially important in P5-PPRA because collaboration is not merely a means for completing the project. It is itself part of the character and social learning that the project is intended to cultivate. If group structures reproduce passive participation, the formal project may contradict its developmental aims. Mery et al. (2022) describe student synergy as a key feature of profile-strengthening projects, while Kahfi (2022) emphasizes the relationship between the profile framework and character formation. The present findings add a practical qualification: synergy must be designed and monitored rather than assumed.

P5-PPRA adds a distinctive religious-civic integration challenge

P5-PPRA asks madrasahs to connect the Pancasila Student Profile with the Rahmatan lil 'Alamin profile. This creates an opportunity to integrate civic, ethical, religious, and social-development aims rather than treating them as separate curricular messages. It also adds conceptual work for teachers. Facilitators need to understand how project activities embody both profiles and how those values can be made visible in student decisions, collaboration, responsibility, and reflection. Without this interpretive work, profile language can remain at the level of labels attached to activities.

Research in madrasah contexts has shown growing experimentation with P5 and PPRA, including attempts to connect project learning with character, Islamic values, and institutional culture (Agustine, 2024; Anggita & Wati, 2024; Kohar et al., 2024). The case suggests that integration is strongest when profile dimensions are translated into observable practices. For example, cooperation can be connected to how students distribute responsibility; respect for diversity can be connected to how different perspectives are handled; environmental or social themes can be connected to evidence gathering and community action. Operationalization makes the values teachable without reducing them to checklists.

Time should include preparation and reflection, not only activity

The one-week block created a visible space for the project but also intensified pressure. Block scheduling can protect project time from fragmentation, yet a compressed block may encourage attention to producing an output rather than revisiting ideas. Project learning requires time before, during, and after visible activity. Preparation allows students to understand the problem and their roles; implementation allows inquiry and production; reflection allows them to articulate what changed in their understanding, values, or collaborative practices.

A more mature schedule could therefore distribute project work across phases. Some preparatory tasks may occur before the block; the block can concentrate fieldwork, collaboration, or production; and follow-up sessions can be used for reflection and assessment. Such sequencing also reduces the risk that ordinary subject

learning and project demands compete abruptly for the same time. The broader Merdeka Curriculum literature emphasizes flexibility, but flexibility is educationally useful only when schools use it to create coherent learning time rather than simply compressing requirements (Ariga, 2022; Faiz et al., 2022).

Financing is a pedagogical equity issue

Financial pressure should not be treated as an external logistical detail. Projects that rely heavily on purchased materials, transportation, or elaborate products can create unequal participation and shift attention from learning to production. A resource-sensitive design asks which objectives genuinely require expenditure and which can be achieved through locally available materials, school resources, community data, or low-cost inquiry. This is especially important because the developmental goals of P5-PPRA concern character, reasoning, collaboration, and social awareness rather than the material sophistication of a final product.

Schools can address this issue through common resource budgets, transparent cost ceilings, reusable materials, and project themes that prioritize investigation or service over consumption. Such arrangements also help facilitators focus assessment on process and reasoning. The case thus broadens the concept of readiness: financial readiness is not simply the availability of money, but the capacity to design learning that remains equitable under real resource constraints.

Teacher readiness is collective as well as individual

The findings caution against locating implementation problems solely in individual teachers. Facilitators operated within schedules, modules, coordination routines, and resource conditions established collectively. Teacher readiness certainly includes knowledge of project pedagogy and assessment, but it also depends on whether the institution provides time to plan, opportunities to learn with colleagues, accessible examples, and clear channels for resolving problems. In this sense, readiness is an organizational property as much as a personal one.

A practical implication is to use each project cycle as professional learning. After implementation, coordinators and facilitators can review which tasks produced meaningful student engagement, where groups became uneven, which resources created pressure, and which profile dimensions were difficult to observe. These reflections can be used to revise the next module. Such iterative improvement is more realistic than expecting complete readiness before a new curriculum is implemented, particularly during early adoption (Arifin, 2023; Ana, 2023).

Assessment should examine enactment, not only products

The procedural-substantive distinction also has implications for assessment. If evaluation focuses mainly on whether a project was completed and whether students produced a final artifact, implementation can appear successful while important learning processes remain invisible. Assessment should include evidence of planning, contribution, reasoning, collaboration, reflection, and connection to profile dimensions. Student self-assessment and peer assessment can complement facilitator judgment when criteria are explicit.

This approach aligns with the project-oriented logic of the Pancasila Student Profile, which is intended to develop capacities through experience rather than through memorization alone (Irawati et al., 2022; Safitri et al., 2022). It also creates better evidence for future research. Instead of relying only on perceptions that a project was useful, researchers can examine student work, reflection, observation records, and rubric patterns to understand which dimensions of learning were actually enacted.

Implications and limits of the case

For school leaders, the case suggests a staged readiness model: establish formal structures, protect planning time, develop modules collaboratively, clarify profile dimensions, design accountable group roles, secure equitable resources, monitor implementation, and conduct a structured post-project review. The sequence does not guarantee uniform outcomes, but it converts implementation from a one-time compliance event into an organizational learning cycle. This is especially relevant for madrasahs that must coordinate national profile goals with the distinctive religious and cultural purposes of PPRA.

The case is bounded to one madrasah and ten purposively selected informants, so its findings should not be generalized statistically. It captures an early implementation period in August 2024 and may therefore emphasize start-up difficulties that could diminish as experience grows. Future research could follow successive project cycles, compare madrasahs with different resource conditions, and collect systematic evidence of student learning and character development. Longitudinal designs would be particularly useful for testing whether procedural readiness becomes substantive capacity over time.

Curriculum leadership should create shared interpretation

The vice principal, coordinator, and facilitators occupied different positions in the implementation chain, which means leadership involved more than issuing a schedule. Leaders needed to create a shared interpretation

of the project's aims and quality criteria. Without that shared interpretation, teams can comply with the same timetable while enacting very different pedagogical models. Regular design meetings before implementation, brief coordination huddles during the project, and a structured debrief afterward can make leadership more developmental. This is consistent with the observation that P5 implementation challenges often concern how teachers interpret curricular expectations, not simply whether they know that a program exists (Ana, 2023; Arifin, 2023).

Shared interpretation also reduces dependence on individual facilitators. When expectations are tacit, experienced teachers may improvise effectively while others struggle. A common design language—objectives, profile dimensions, milestones, evidence, reflection, and assessment—makes collaboration easier and supports continuity when personnel change. Readiness therefore includes institutional memory: the capacity to carry lessons from one project cycle into the next.

Facilitator learning should be embedded in implementation

The case suggests that professional learning is most useful when connected directly to the project teachers are preparing. Generic workshops can introduce concepts, but facilitators also need opportunities to examine sample modules, anticipate student difficulties, design assessment evidence, and rehearse how they will respond to uneven group participation. Short lesson-study or design-studio routines could allow facilitators to critique one another's plans before the project starts.

After implementation, the same team can use student products, observation notes, and facilitator reflections to revise the module. This creates a feedback loop between curriculum and professional learning. The aim is not to eliminate adaptation but to make adaptation cumulative. Each cycle should leave the organization with better examples, clearer criteria, and stronger coordination than the previous one.

Student voice can improve both design and accountability

The inclusion of five students in the case reveals that students can identify implementation problems adults may not see, including mismatch between assigned roles and capacities and unequal contribution within groups. Student voice should therefore be used prospectively, not only as research data. Before a project, students can help identify accessible themes, realistic resource demands, and preferred ways of demonstrating learning. During implementation, short check-ins can surface group imbalance before it becomes entrenched.

Student voice does not mean transferring curriculum responsibility entirely to learners. It means treating students as participants who can provide information about how the design is functioning. This is compatible with the agency-oriented goals of the Pancasila Student Profile and with project pedagogy more broadly. A project designed to cultivate responsibility is stronger when students have structured opportunities to exercise and reflect on responsibility.

Religious and civic profiles should converge in concrete practice

P5-PPRA is distinctive because it combines national civic-profile aspirations with Rahmatan lil 'Alamin values in a madrasah context. Integration should occur at the level of action, not only terminology. A project on environmental responsibility, for example, can connect stewardship, evidence-based problem solving, community cooperation, and respect for shared resources. A social theme can connect deliberation, empathy, justice, and responsible citizenship. These connections help students experience religious and civic commitments as mutually reinforcing rather than as parallel lists.

This approach is consistent with emerging studies of P5-PPRA in madrasahs that emphasize character formation and the recontextualization of Islamic values within project activity (Agustine, 2024; Anggita & Wati, 2024; Kohar et al., 2024). The case contributes by showing that integration requires facilitation capacity. Values become visible when tasks require students to make choices, cooperate, justify decisions, and reflect on consequences.

Community-connected projects can reduce product orientation

One way to reduce pressure for elaborate products is to frame projects around investigation, service, or community communication. Students can map a local issue, interview community members, analyze school data, design a low-cost campaign, or propose an evidence-based improvement. Such tasks keep attention on inquiry and contribution rather than purchased materials. They also offer richer evidence of the profile dimensions being developed.

Community connection should still be scaled to school capacity. The point is not to make every project large or public, but to create authentic consequences for student decisions. Even a school-based issue can provide authenticity when students gather evidence and present recommendations to a real audience. This can strengthen motivation while keeping financing manageable.

A readiness dashboard could support iterative improvement

The procedural-substantive distinction can be translated into a simple internal monitoring framework. Procedural indicators might include team formation, schedule approval, module readiness, resource allocation, and assessment preparation. Substantive indicators might include facilitator understanding, clarity of student roles, equity of participation, quality of reflection, evidence of profile dimensions, and post-project learning. Reviewing both sets prevents the organization from equating administrative completion with educational quality.

Such a dashboard should not become another compliance burden. Its purpose is to support conversation and prioritization. A school may decide that its procedural structures are adequate but group participation remains weak; the next cycle can then focus professional learning on facilitation and role design. Over time, this creates a traceable organizational learning process rather than repeated reinvention.

Research should follow implementation across cycles

Because the present study captured an early phase in August 2024, it offers a baseline for longitudinal inquiry. A follow-up could examine whether modules are prepared earlier, whether facilitators develop shared routines, whether costs fall as resources are reused, and whether student participation becomes more balanced. Following the same institution would show whether procedural readiness becomes substantive capacity through experience.

Comparative research across madrasahs could then examine how leadership, resources, school culture, and teacher collaboration shape different trajectories. Mixed-method designs could combine implementation observations with student reflections and rubric-based evidence of profile development. These approaches would strengthen the evidence base without reducing P5-PPRA to a single outcome score.

From start-up implementation to institutional routine

The case is best understood as a start-up phase rather than a final judgment on P5-PPRA. New curriculum practices often begin with visible structures before tacit knowledge develops. Facilitators learn how long activities actually take, what kinds of roles students can manage, which resources are reusable, and where coordination fails only after experiencing a cycle. The key institutional question is whether those experiences are captured and converted into improved routines. If lessons remain individual and undocumented, each cycle begins again from uncertainty. If they are shared, procedural structures can gradually accumulate substantive meaning.

For that reason, implementation quality should be reviewed longitudinally. A school that still shows the same problems after several cycles faces a different issue from a school whose first cycle is uneven but whose planning, participation, and reflection improve. A learning-oriented evaluation can therefore compare cycles on a small number of agreed indicators rather than treating one project as a definitive success or failure. This perspective respects the developmental character of curriculum reform while still holding the institution accountable for improvement.

The distinction also provides a useful message for policy implementation more broadly. Central guidance can establish aims and minimum structures, but substantive capacity is built locally through interpretation, practice, feedback, and adaptation. Support systems should therefore provide exemplars, facilitator networks, and opportunities for schools to learn from implementation evidence rather than relying only on administrative reporting.

A practical implication is to distinguish non-negotiable program requirements from locally adaptable design choices. Clear minimum expectations can protect the integrity of P5-PPRA, while local flexibility allows the madrasah to select themes, resources, schedules, and community connections that fit its context. This balance reduces two risks: implementation becoming mechanical compliance, or local adaptation becoming so loose that profile goals are difficult to recognize. Documenting which elements are fixed and which are adaptable can make coordination more efficient and help facilitators justify their design decisions.

This approach also gives future reviewers a clearer evidence trail because changes in planning, facilitation, participation, and reflection can be compared across project cycles rather than inferred from completion alone. This strengthens continuity and institutional accountability. It also helps coordinators identify which implementation problems require immediate support and which should become priorities for the next cycle.

Conclusion

Implementation of P5-PPRA at MAN 2 Kota Padang showed clear procedural readiness: the madrasah formed a facilitation structure, assigned roles, selected themes, and established a block schedule. At the same time, substantive enactment remained uneven. Module development overlapped with implementation, student responsibilities were not always distributed effectively, time and financing created pressure, coordination was incomplete, and collaboration varied across groups. The case therefore demonstrates why formal completion should not be equated with mature implementation.

The study conceptualizes readiness as an organizational learning process. Quality improves when leadership, facilitators, teachers, students, schedules, resources, project modules, assessment, and reflection become progressively aligned. For practice, the priority is not adding more procedures but strengthening the translation from procedure to pedagogy: protected planning time, explicit and observable profile dimensions, accountable group roles, equitable resource design, process-oriented assessment, and post-project review. Future longitudinal and comparative studies should examine whether repeated project cycles transform these early procedural structures into durable substantive capacity.

Declarations

Author contribution

Author 1: developed the main research idea and objectives, designed the research methodology, conducted data collection and investigation, performed the data analysis, and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. Author 2: contributed to the development and implementation of the research methodology, supported the data collection and investigation process, and reviewed and revised the manuscript to improve its academic quality, clarity, and structure, provided input into the research concept and direction, supervised and guided the overall research process, reviewed and improved the manuscript, and contributed to obtaining financial support or research funding

Funding

The research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest related to the publication of this article.

Use of generative AI

Generative AI were used solely for translation and language editing of the manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and accuracy of the article.

Acknowledgments

Authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all parties who contributed to and supported the completion of this study. Their valuable assistance, support, and encouragement are greatly appreciated.

References

- Agustine, T. F. (2024). Implementasi Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila Dan Profil Pelajar Rahmatan Lil'alamin (P5PPRA) di Kelas XI MAN 1 Solok Plus Keterampilan. UIN Imam Bonjol Padang.
- Ana, A. N. F. (2023). Analisis Kesulitan Guru Dalam Mengimplementasikan Kurikulum Merdeka. *Mubtadi: Jurnal Pendidikan Ibtidaiyah*, 4(2), 96-110.
- Anggita, A., & Wati, S. (2024). Implementasi Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (P5) Dan Profil Pelajar Rahmatan Lil'alamin Dalam Pembentukan Karakter Peserta Didik Kelas VII di MTsN 2 Pasaman Barat. *Nashr Al-Islam: Jurnal Kajian Literatur Islam*, 6(4).
- Annisa, D. N., Agustina, R. L., Noormaliah, N., Lismayanti, H., & Rafiah, H. (2024). Problematika Guru dalam Menerapkan Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (P5) Kelas IV SDN Purwosari Baru 1. *Alacrity: Journal of Education*, 475-495.
- Aprila, M., Bentri, A., & Amsal, M. F. (2024). Pelaksanaan Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (P5) dan Profil Pelajar Rahmatan Lil Alamin (P2RA) Sebagai Perwujudan Penerapan Kurikulum Merdeka di MAN 1 Padang Pariaman. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(1), 11470-11478.
- Arifin, H. N. (2023). Problematika Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka di MA Al-Amin Tabanan Tahun Pelajaran 2023/2024. *Widya Balina: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Ekonomi*; 8(1), 909 - 918.
- Ariga, S. (2022). Implementasi kurikulum merdeka pasca pandemi covid-19. *Edu Society: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(2), 662-670.
- Faiz, A., Parhan, M., & Ananda, R. (2022). Paradigma baru dalam kurikulum prototipe. *Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4(1), 1544-1550.
- Hadi, E. S., Rahmadhani, R., & Putra, E. V. (2024). Penerapan model pembelajaran Grup Investigasi (GI) dalam upaya peningkatan keterampilan kerjasama peserta didik pada pembelajaran sosiologi. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(1), 8-17.

- Ikrami, R. W., Pratiwi, N., & Fatmariza, F. (2024). Integrasi game dalam pembelajaran Pendidikan Pancasila untuk meningkatkan motivasi belajar siswa. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(1), 18-30.
- Iqbal, Y., & Rahmadhani, R. (2024). Penerapan media ajar worksheet guna meningkatkan aktivitas belajar siswa kelas X pada mata pelajaran sosiologi. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Irawati, D., Iqbal, A. M., Hasanah, A., & Arifin, B. S. (2022). Profil Pelajar Pancasila sebagai upaya mewujudkan karakter bangsa. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(1), 1224-1238. <https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v6i1.3622>
- Iswadi, M. P., Karnati, N., Ahmad Andry, B., & Adab, P. (2023). Studi Kasus: Desain Dan Metode Robert K. Yin. Penerbit Adab.
- Kahfi, A. (2022). Implementasi Profil Pelajar Pancasila dan implikasinya terhadap karakter siswa di sekolah. *Dirasah: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pendidikan Dasar Islam*, 5(2), 138-151.
- Kohar, A., Abdullah, A., Hambali, A. & Basri, H. (2024). Reaktualisasi Nilai-Nilai Keislaman Melalui Implementasi Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila dan Profil Pelajar Rahmatan Lilalamin (P5- Ppra). *Pendas : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*; 9(2).
- Mery, M., Martono, M., Halidjah, S., & Hartoyo, A. (2022). Sinergi peserta didik dalam proyek penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(5), 7840-7849. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i5.3617>
- Rachmawati, N., Marini, A., Nafiah, M., & Nurasiah, I. (2022). Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila dalam implementasi Kurikulum Prototipe di sekolah penggerak jenjang sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 3613-3625. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2714>
- Safitri, A., Wulandari, D., & Herlambang, Y. T. (2022). Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila: Sebuah orientasi baru pendidikan dalam meningkatkan karakter siswa Indonesia. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(4), 7076-7086. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3274>
- Saputra, R. A., & Putra, D. M. (2024). Penerapan model pembelajaran Problem Based Learning (PBL) dipadu metode Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) untuk meningkatkan aktivitas belajar siswa mata pelajaran sosiologi. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(1), 31-43.
- Satria, I. S. E., & Yafterson, R. B. (2024). Penerapan model pembelajaran Project Based Learning untuk meningkatkan aktivitas belajar peserta didik di SMA Negeri 15 Padang. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(1), 44-53.